



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and the courts will not resort to the journals to impeach it. *Kelley v. Marron* (N. Mex.), 153 Pac. 562. See NOTES, p. 445.

TAXATION—CORPORATE SHARES—SITUS OF STOCK.—The defendant was the owner of stock in a foreign corporation. When this stock was assessed for taxation in the defendant's domicile, the assessment was resisted on the ground that the stock had already been taxed by the state of incorporation. *Held*, the stock is properly taxable. *Bellows Falls Power Co. v. Commonwealth* (Mass.), 109 N. E. 891. See NOTES, p. 460.

WILLS—GIFTS CAUSA MORTIS—ELEMENTS.—A mother, being ill and preparing to undergo a surgical operation, told her husband that she wished her son to have a certain designated portion of her personality in the event of her death. She died after the operation and shortly thereafter the husband became a bankrupt. In the bankruptcy proceedings it was sought to subject to the claims of creditors the property designated as a gift to the son. *Held*, the facts do not show a valid gift *causa mortis*. *In re Liphart*, 227 Fed. 135.

A gift *causa mortis* is a voluntary, executed transfer intended as a gift of a present interest in personal property, accompanied by delivery and acceptance and made by an owner in peril of death and because of such peril. *Thomas v. Lewis*, 89 Va. 1, 15 S. E. 389, 37 Am. St. Rep. 848, 18 L. R. A. 170; *Danziger v. Bank*, 86 Misc. 316, 149 N. Y. Supp. 207. See article 1 VA. LAW REG. 872, 882. The donee's interest in the gift is revocable by the donor expressly revoking the gift, his recovery from the peril, his surviving the donee, or by the superior claims of creditors. See *Basket v. Hassell*, 107 U. S. 602; *Pierce v. Bank*, 129 Mass. 425; *Mitchell v. Rease*, 7 Cush. 350. The delivery of the gift, however, may be made to a third person for the donee. *Marshall v. Berry*, 13 Allen (Mass.) 43; *Johnson v. Colley*, 101 Va. 414, 44 S. E. 721, 99 Am. St. Rep. 684. Acceptance by the donee in such a case is presumed. *Forbes v. Jason*, 6 Ill. App. 395; *Devol v. Dye*, 123 Ind. 321, 24 N. E. 246, 7 L. R. A. 439. And there may be a constructive delivery, as by handing over the keys to a trunk or box. *Thomas v. Lewis*, *supra*. Some courts hold that a previous and continuing possession by the donee of the property sought to be given, though by the authority of the donor, is not a sufficient delivery to uphold a gift *causa mortis*. *Miller v. Jeffress*, 4 Gratt. (Va.) 472; *Drew v. Hagerty*, 81 Me. 231, 17 Atl. 63, 10 Am. St. Rep. 255. Though others hold that no formal delivery is necessary in such a case. *Stevens v. Stevens*, 2 Hun (N. Y.) 470; *Southerland v. Southerland*, 5 Bush. (Ky.) 591. Nor need the donor die from the anticipated peril to sustain the validity of such a gift, provided he does not recover therefrom before death from another cause. *Ridden v. Thrall*, 125 N. Y. 572, 26 N. E. 627, 21 Am. St. Rep. 758, 11 L. R. A. 684. In order to effectuate a valid gift *causa mortis* the proof sustaining it must be clear, convincing and satisfactory. *Schuyler v. Stephens*, 28 R. I. 506, 68 Atl. 311; *Stewart v. Stokes*, 177 Mo. App. 390, 164 S. W. 156; *Davis v. Davis*, 104 N. Y. Supp. 824. And it is held by some courts that a donor may by such a gift